arXiv:1610.09542v1 [q-fin.RM] 29 Oct 2016

Managing Systemic Risk in Financial Networks

Nils Detering*†, Thilo Meyer-Brandis‡, Konstantinos Panagiotou§, Daniel Ritter¶

November 1, 2016

Abstract

To quantify and manage systemic risk in the interbank market, we propose a weighted, directed random network model. The vertices in the network are financial institutions and the weighted edges represent monetary exposures between them. Our model resembles the strong degree of heterogeneity observed in empirical data and the parameters of the model can easily be fitted to market data. We derive asymptotic results that, based on these parameters, allow to determine the impact of local shocks to the entire system and the wider economy. Furthermore, we characterize resilient and non-resilient cases. For networks with degree sequences without second moment, a small number of initially defaulted banks can trigger a substantial default cascade even under the absence of so called *contagious links*. Paralleling regulatory discussions we determine minimal capital requirements for financial institutions sufficient to make the network resilient to small shocks.

Keywords: systemic risk, financial contagion, capital requirements, inhomogeneous random graphs, weighted random graphs, directed random graphs

1 Introduction

Systemic Risk was already listed as one of five types of risk financial institutions are exposed to by Duffie and Singleton in 2003 [14]. However, after the financial crisis of 2007 it gained major importance. Research is now very diverse and parallels latest regulatory discussions that take systemic risk considerations into account (see [3], [6]). This is due to the harm caused by the failure of some large financial institutions to the entire financial system and the real economy. An overview on the different approaches to analyze systemic risk can be gained from [17]. One line of research addresses explicitly the network structure of the financial system in order to understand dependencies. In this setting, financial institutions correspond to vertices in the network and edges represent some form of dependency among them, for example monetary exposures. The

*Department of Statistics and Applied Probability, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA. Email: detering@pstat.ucsb.edu

†Nils Detering acknowledges financial support from the LMUexcellent initiative, the "Frankfurter Institut für Risikomanagement und Regulierung (FIRM)" and the Europlace Finance Institute. Part of this research was performed while the author was visiting the Institute for Pure and Applied Mathematics (IPAM), which is supported by the National Science Foundation. Another part was performed during a stay at the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences.

‡Department of Mathematics, University of Munich, Theresienstraße 39, 80333 Munich, Germany. Email: meyerbr@math.lmu.de

§Department of Mathematics, University of Munich, Theresienstraße 39, 80333 Munich, Germany. Email: kpanagio@math.lmu.de

¶Department of Mathematics, University of Munich, Theresienstraße 39, 80333 Munich, Germany. Email: ritter@math.lmu.de

recently appeared monograph [20] serves as a good reference for methods relying on network models, which is also the focus of this paper. In [20], Hurd summarizes recent literature and identifies *Systemic Risk* as comprising some triggering shock event, a propagation of this shock through the system and a major impact on the macroeconomy. For the second, he further lists *Asset Correlation*, *Default Contagion*, *Liquidity Contagion*, and *Market Illiquidity and Asset Fire Sales* as the four main channels via which the triggering shock event propagates to other parts of the financial system.

There are by now many papers which are concerned with modeling the channel of *Default Contagion* based on a network model where knots are financial institutions and edges monetary exposures between them. Note that monetary exposures between banks can be more various than only usual *Loans*. In [26], the authors further investigate the exposures resulting from *Securities Cross-holdings*, *Derivatives* and *Foreign Exchange*. The most famous model for *Default Contagion* probably is the one by Eisenberg and Noe ([15]), where uniqueness of a clearing vector is investigated for liabilities when some institutions cannot fully pay off their debt. It has been criticized for its assumption that default happens without any additional costs, however. For this and other reasons, it has been extended in [28] and [29] for example. Gai and Kapadia even assumed a recovery rate of zero or, expressed differently, default costs of 100% [18]. This is reasonable for investigating the contagion mechanism in financial networks since processing defaults may take months or even years – time that institutions in financial distress do usually not have.

When describing the financial system as a network, there are several possible ways of obtaining the network structure. The first one is to work directly with the structure observed in real financial networks. This is the approach used by Eisenberg and Noe [15] and its extensions. Similarly, [8] develops matrix majorization tools that allow to compare financial systems with different liability concentration in terms of the systemic loss generated. Financial networks also experience some change over time, however, and to make statements about the resilience of possible scenarios of the financial system in future it is not advisable to simply consider today's observed network. In [10] for example, the authors develop a structural default model and use a Bayesian network approach to derive formulas for the joint default and survival probability that can be computed explicitly. Although not directly related to a default cascade, another structural stochastic model that describes interbank lending was proposed in [16] and extended respectively modified in [23] and [9].

An alternative approach, and the one being followed in this paper, is to consider a random graph which is such that each sample resembles the important characteristics of the real network. This allows for a more thorough analysis and the derivation of asymptotic results when the network is large. A popular choice for such a random model is the description by the configuration model, as pursued by Amini et al. [2] for example, where the authors derived the result that a financial network is always resilient to small initial shocks if each bank can sustain at least the default of its largest debtor. Those debts were referred to as *Contagious Links*. The description of the system by a random graph according to the configuration model has the advantage that it entails the possibility of representing inhomogeneous systems such as core-periphery systems, where a few large banks are connected to many other large or small banks, but small banks are connected only to few others. This is one key property of real world financial networks. See for example [12] where the authors show a strong core-periphery structure of the German banking system.

It is, however, even the case that real systems are such inhomogeneous that their degree distributions do not fulfill a second moment condition anymore. Evidence of this for the example of the Brazilian banking system was given in [11] and for the Austrian banking system in [7]. It is then a result due to Janson in [21] that the probability of a graph resulting from the

configuration model being simple shrinks to zero as the number of banks becomes large. This is a major drawback since simple graphs are necessary to analyze default contagion. In [13], the first three authors of this paper have hence developed a directed random graph model which combines all desired properties of a model for financial networks such as directedness, simplicity, inhomogeneity and the absence of second moments. Furthermore, it evades the problem revealed by Olhede and Wolfe in [25] that the likelihood interpretation loses its exactness when applied to the configuration model due to the fact that it does not yield simple graphs in general. This problem does not occur for the weight-based formulation pursued in [13]. The model [13] , however, lacks the weighted edges that can represent values of exposures between different institutions. Instead, the contagion mechanism is described by integer-valued thresholds that represented the numbers of neighbors of each bank which needed to default in order for the particular bank to default as well, rather than the actual monetary loss a bank can sustain. First evidence that the absence of contagious links is not enough to ensure resilience of a system was given in an example. Based on the threshold model from [13], we develop a new random network model in this paper which is capable of describing monetary edge-weights and is hence, to our knowledge, the first simple, weighted and directed random graph model for financial systems that captures the very inhomogeneous structure of real world networks. In particular, this paper makes the following contributions to current research:

1. *Description of a simple, weighted, directed, inhomogeneous random graph model without second moment*
   As outlined above, we will describe a model that combines all properties of financial systems that have been observed in real financial networks such as simplicity and directedness of the links between institutions, weighted connections and a strong degree of inhomogeneity. In doing so, we make use of the threshold model as introduced in [13] and decouple the modeling of edge-weights from their occurrence. This will allow us to translate the mathematical results for the threshold model derived in [13] to our new model. That is, we will be able to make asymptotic statements about the impact that fundamental defaults have on the financial system and the wider economy due to their propagation through the network via a cascade mechanism. At this, our setup allows to account for the relevance each bank has to the financial network or the real economy, for example by providing infrastructure for the payment system or a considerable share in the lending business to the economy. This is in line with latest regulatory methods where banks are placed into certain buckets depending on their systemic importance (see [3] and [6]). Further, we can make statements about the resilience or non-resilience of systems depending on their network parameters. In particular, we will see that without a second moment condition the absence of contagious links is not sufficient for resilience of a system anymore as it was the case in [2].

2. *Rigorous derivation of risk capital that is sufficient to ensure resilience*
   After the description of the model, we will be able to mathematically derive a formula for the risk capital that is enough to make the system resilient to initial shocks. Due to the fact that we allow for infinite second moments in our model, the derived risk capital will be more restrictive than simply prohibiting contagious links. We derive an exact formula for a threshold that will make the system resilient and relies on the expected in-degree w^- of a certain bank by a sublinear form $\alpha(w^-)^\gamma$, where $\alpha > 0$ and $\gamma < 1$. It is exact in the sense that sharp barriers α^{crit} and γ^{crit} for the values of α and γ exists below which the system is non-resilient and above which it is always resilient. This contributes to the ongoing discussion about adequate risk capital that was for example discussed by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision in [3] or by the Board of Governors of the

Federal Reserve System in [6]. It is interesting to note that the derived threshold function replicates the one from [2] if we restrict our model to degrees that admit a second moment. Also it is in line with the analysis in [8] where it was found that the real network topology is *balanced* and as a consequence a deconcentration of exposures is desirable for stability. Since banks try to avoid high risk capital, the introduction of our capital requirements would lead to a change in the network topology. This is similar to the situation in [27], where the authors investigated the impact of a systemic risk tax on a financial network. The difference is that in our case the regulated network is likely to develop more edges than the unregulated one whereas the systemic risk tax in [27] leads to a shifting of the edge endpoints to systemically less risky banks.

The paper is structured as follows: In Section 2, we introduce our new model for financial systems and relate it to the one from [13] in order to derive results about the final set of defaulted banks and their relevance, as well as the resilience respectively non-resilience of the system. In the third section, we provide a rigorous proof of the formula describing the necessary risk capital of banks in a financial system. In Section 4 finally, we pursue simulation studies to support our findings.

2 A weighted, directed random graph

We shall develop a model for a weighted, directed financial network. It will be based on the directed random graph model proposed in [13] for unweighted, directed financial networks but complemented by edge weights. It will then be possible to extend the results from [13] for an unweighted structure to our new model.

2.1 Model Description

We want to describe a financial network consisting of financial institutions, such as banks, and monetary exposures, such as debt claims, between them. If $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is the size of the network, we will label the institutions by indices $i \in [n]$, where $[n]$ denotes the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$, and interpret them as vertices in a graph. Claims between institutions shall be represented by a set of weighted, directed edges. We do not allow for multiple edges between vertices and self loops, such that in total there are $n^2 - n$ possible edges. We denote by Ω the set of all possible configurations of weighted edges $\Omega := \{\omega \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n} \mid \omega_{i,i} = 0, i \in [n]\}$, represented by matrices ω with non-negative entries and zero diagonal elements. For $\omega \in \Omega$ a positive entry $\omega_{i,j} > 0$ means that in the network represented by ω, there is a directed edge from vertex i to j with weight $\omega_{i,j}$.

We propose a way to define a probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ where $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^\Omega$ is a σ-algebra to be specified later. The probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ is such that $\mathbb{P}(e_{i,j} \leq x | e_{i,j} > 0) = \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(E_{i,j} \leq x)$ for $x > 0$, where the random matrix $e : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}_+^{n\times n}$, $e(\omega) := \omega$, represents random draws of weighted edges and $E_{i,j}$ is some additional random variable defined on an extended probability space with the property $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(E_{i,j} > 0) = 1$ for $i \neq j$. That is, we want to uncouple the occurrence of an edge sent from i to j from the size of its possible edge-weight. In order to do so, we proceed by defining a probability measure for an unweighted, directed random network as proposed in [13].

2.1.1 Modeling edges

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the vertex set $[n]$ and the set D of unweighted, directed edges defined as $D := \{(i, j) \mid i, j \in [n], i \neq j\}$. Let $\Omega_1 := \{0, 1\}^{|D|}$ and $\mathcal{F}_1 := 2^{\Omega_1}$, such that

for $\omega \in \Omega_1$, a configuration of the links in the financial network, it is denoted by $\omega_{(i,j)} = 1$ if the directed edge (i,j) is present in the network and $\omega_{(i,j)} = 0$ otherwise. We define a probability measure $\mathbb{P}_1$ on $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$ by the following procedure. To each vertex $i \in [n]$ we assign two deterministic vertex-weights $w_i^- = w_i^-(n) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $w_i^+ = w_i^+(n) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and define the probability $p_{i,j} = p_{i,j}(n)$ of a directed edge from vertex i to vertex j being present by

$$p_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \min\left\{1, \frac{w_i^+ w_j^-}{n}\right\}, & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

Further, we let $X_{i,j}$ the indicator function for edge (i,j) sent from vertex i to vertex j being present and assume that these events are independent for all edges $(i,j) \in D$. We denote the weight sequences by $\mathbf{w}^-(n) = (w_1^-(n), \ldots, w_n^-(n))$ respectively $\mathbf{w}^+(n) = (w_1^+(n), \ldots, w_n^+(n))$ and the resulting random graph by $G_n(\mathbf{w}^-, \mathbf{w}^+)$. The role of w_i^- respectively w_i^+ is to determine the tendency of vertex $i \in [n]$ to have incoming respectively outgoing edges. The vertex-weights are deterministic and purely used as a mean to specify the edge probabilities. They should not be confused with the edge-weights which are probabilistic and can only be read off from each sample individually. In the following, when we use the term *weighted* or *unweighted* networks, we always refer to the edge-weights $e_{(i,j)}$ and not to the vertex-weights (w_i^-, w_i^+).

We shall impose the following regularity conditions on the sequences of weight sequences:

Assumption 2.1. *Let the empirical distribution function of the vertex-weights be given by*

$$F_n(x,y) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{1}\{w_i^-(n) \leq x, w_i^+(n) \leq y\}, \quad (x,y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2,$$

and let (W_n^-, W_n^+) be a random vector distributed according to F_n. Then we make the following assumptions on the sequences of weight sequences:

1. ***Convergence of weight distribution:*** *There exists a distribution function F on $\mathbb{R}_+^2$ such that $F(x,y) = 0$ for all $x, y \leq x_0$ and $x_0 > 0$ small enough, and such that at all continuity points (x,y) of F it holds $\lim_{n\to\infty} F_n(x,y) = F(x,y)$.*
2. ***Convergence of average weights:*** *If we denote by (W^-, W^+) a random vector distributed according to the limiting distribution F from 1., then both W^- and W^+ are integrable and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[W_n^-] = \mathbb{E}[W^-]$ as well as $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[W_n^+] = \mathbb{E}[W^+]$.*

These assumptions were already required in [13] and will hence be necessary in order to extend the main result of [13] to our new model.

2.1.2 Modeling edge-weights

Now that we have modeled the occurrence of edges in the financial network, we can proceed by modeling their weight. For this, we assume the existence of a second probability space $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$ which captures for each pair of vertices $(i,j) \in [n]^2$ with $i \neq j$ a (possibly deterministic) random number $E_{i,j} > 0$ that represents the possible exposure on j induced by i. Further, we set $E_{i,i} = 0$ for all $i \in [n]$ and denote the resulting random matrix by

$$\mathbf{E} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & E_{1,2} & \cdots & E_{1,n} \\ E_{2,1} & 0 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & E_{n-1,n} \\ E_{n,1} & \cdots & E_{n,n-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

To make the model analytically tractable, we assume that for each bank j the list of possible exposures $E_{1,j}, \dots, E_{j-1,j}, E_{j+1,j}, \dots, E_{n,j}$ is an exchangeable sequence of random variables. That is, we assume that for each $j \in [n]$ and each permutation $\pi \in \Sigma_{[n]\setminus\{j\}}$ of the set $[n]\setminus\{j\}$ it holds that

$$(E_{1,j}, \dots, E_{j-1,j}, E_{j+1,j}, \dots, E_{n,j}) \stackrel{d}{=} \left(E_{\pi(1),j}, \dots, E_{\pi(j-1),j}, E_{\pi(j+1),j}, \dots, E_{\pi(n),j}\right).$$

This gain in tractability of the model goes along with some loss of generality. When observing exposures of banks in real financial networks, however, it is sensible to model the exposures either directly as a uniform random draw from this empirical list or at least symmetrically for all neighbors. For example, one could uniformly choose one exposure from j's empirical exposure list for each debtor i of bank j and model i's exposure on j by an exponentially distributed random variable whose expected value equals the drawn value. In general, one can always generate a sequence of exchangeable random variables for the exposures of bank j by taking an arbitrary sequence of random variables $\tilde{E}_{1,j}, \dots, \tilde{E}_{j-1,j}, \tilde{E}_{j+1,j}, \dots, \tilde{E}_{n,j}$ and transforming them into a list $E_{1,j}, \dots, E_{j-1,j}, E_{j+1,j}, \dots, E_{n,j}$ by defining $E_{i,j} = \tilde{E}_{\pi(i),j}$ for some permutation π that is independent of the family $\{E_{i,j}\}_{i\in[n]\setminus\{j\}}$ and uniformly drawn from the set $\Sigma_{[n]\setminus\{j\}}$ of all permutations of the set $[n]\setminus\{j\}$. The assumption of exchangeability of exposure lists is not completely new. It has been made in other papers, such as [2] for example, before.

2.1.3 The combined model

Having modeled the occurrence of edges and their weights separately on the probability spaces $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \mathbb{P}_1)$ respectively $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, \mathbb{P}_2)$, we can then define the product measure $\tilde{\mathbb{P}} := \mathbb{P}_1 \times \mathbb{P}_2$ on the product space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}) := (\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}_2)$ that comprises all involved quantities and where the unweighted, directed random graph and the exposure lists are mutually independent.

We define the map $F : \tilde{\Omega} \to \Omega$ by

$$F(\omega_1, \omega_2) = (X_{i,j}(\omega_1)E_{i,j}(\omega_2))_{i,j}, \tag{2}$$

and the σ-algebra $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^{\Omega}$ by

$$\mathcal{F} := \{B \mid F^{-1}(B) \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}\}. \tag{3}$$

Then clearly, F is a measurable map from $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}})$ to $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ and defines a probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ by the pushforward measure $\mathbb{P} := \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \circ F^{-1}$. The interpretation of the edge-weights $X_{i,j}E_{i,j}$ is the following: It is positive if and only if $X_{i,j} = 1$. That is, indeed the occurrence of an edge is fully covered by the unweighted random graph model on $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathbb{P}_1)$. The random variables $E_{i,j}$ on $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, \mathbb{P}_2)$ then model the size of the edge-weight conditional on the event of their occurrence.

2.2 Default contagion

In addition to the exposures, let $\boldsymbol{\nu} = \boldsymbol{\nu}(n) = (\nu_1(n), \nu_2(n), \dots, \nu_n(n))$ be a list of non-negative valued random variables that represent the banks' capital/net worth. A bank $i \in [n]$ shall be called insolvent if $\nu_i = 0$.

The set of *initially defaulted* banks is hence given by $\mathcal{D}_0 = \{i \in [n] \mid \nu_i = 0\}$. They trigger a default cascade $\mathcal{D}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{D}_1 \subseteq ...$ given by

$$\mathcal{D}_k = \{i \in [n] \mid \nu_i \leq \sum_{j\in\mathcal{D}_{k-1}} e_{j,i}\}, \tag{4}$$

where in each step k of the cascade process bank i has to write off its exposures to banks that

defaulted in step $k-1$ and goes bankrupt as soon as its total write-offs exceed its capital. The chain of default sets clearly stabilizes after at most $n-1$ steps and we call $\mathcal{D}_n = \mathcal{D}_{n-1}$ the *final default cluster* in the network generated by the initial defaults $\mathcal{D}_0$.

Conditional on the edge-weights, the outcome $\mathcal{D}_n$ of the cascade process is a deterministic one. It does not make any difference if we somehow change the procedure by which the banks default as given in (4). The only thing that matters is that in each step of the procedure we choose one or more (but not necessarily all) banks whose capital is exceeded by their losses and let them default, until there are no such left. What does change with a particular procedure, however, is the number of neighbors that eventually cause the default of a certain bank since the exposures to different neighbors will usually differ from each other. It hence makes sense to write down a probabilistic threshold value. We do this by defining for each bank $i \in [n]$ the threshold value c_i by

$$c_i(n) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \nu_i \leq 0, \\ \inf\{s \in [n-1] \mid \sum_{l=1}^{s} E_{\rho_i(l),i} \geq \nu_i\}, & \text{else}, \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

where the bijective map $\rho_i : [n-1] \to [n]\backslash\{i\}$ is the natural enumeration of the set $[n]\backslash\{i\}$, that is

$$\rho_i(l) := \begin{cases} l, & \text{if } l < i, \\ l+1, & \text{if } l \geq i. \end{cases}$$

This random threshold value c_i determines the *hypothetical* threshold of the number of neighbors that need to default in order to cause default of vertex i, given that they go bankrupt in the order of their natural index given by ρ_i. The use of the enumeration ρ_i becomes necessary in (5) since we want to spare i in this natural ordering. Observe that c_i is also allowed to take the value ∞ in the case that capital ν_i is larger than the sum of all exposures. In this case, bank i can never default. We denote the threshold sequence by $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}(n) = (c_1(n), \ldots, c_n(n))$. The thresholds as defined in (5) are only *hypothetical*, because the natural order is usually not the one which the vertices default in for a certain procedure and in general there might not even exist a procedure that generates a cascade process with these very thresholds. However, it will turn out in the proof of Theorem 2.5 that the value c_i is still relevant. We will describe a model that has the same distribution as the one described above but that admits the threshold values from (5) for a certain sequential cascade procedure.

2.3 Systemic relevance

In current literature, a typical approach to measure systemic risk in a financial network is to consider the final fraction $|\mathcal{D}_n|/n$ of defaulted banks after a cascade process initiated by some fundamental defaults $\mathcal{D}_0$. *Good* systems should be resilient to small shocks $\mathcal{D}_0$, that is $|\mathcal{D}_n|/n$ should be small, whereas in *bad* systems even a small shock $\mathcal{D}_0$ can lead to default of a significant part $|\mathcal{D}_n|/n$ of the system. As already mentioned in [13] however, it is actually more sensible to consider the impact of the defaults rather than only considering their count. A measure of this impact that is very much in line with our formulation of default contagion in Section 2.2 is *DebtRank* as introduced in [5]. It focuses on the relative monetary impact of a bank in an interbank network. In its framework text from 2013, the *Basel Committee on Banking Supervision* states an indicator-based measurement approach in order to measure global systemic importance of banks. It takes into account *Cross-jurisdictional activity*, *Size*, *Interconnectedness*, *Substitutability/financial institution infrastructure* and the *Complexity* of the banks, all in equal shares. The focus is on the impact of a potential default on the global financial system and wider economy. A second method of measuring importance replaces the

category *Substitutability/financial institution infrastructure* by the *firms reliance on short-term wholesale funding* [6]. Further approaches that compute indicator values of importance for each bank in the system are conceivable. Typically they will focus on the amount of debt owed to the real economy or the contribution to the global financial infrastructure.

We want to include such indicators in our model and assign relevance values $r_i(n) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ to each bank $i \in [n]$. Denote the relevance sequence by $\mathbf{r}(n) = (r_1(n), \dots, r_n(n))$. In order to make the model analytically tractable and to be able to reduce the model to the threshold model from [13], in addition to Assumption 2.1, we need to impose the following assumption:

Assumption 2.2. *For $(x, y, v, l) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3 \times \mathbb{N}_0^\infty$ let $G_n(x, y, v, l)$ be the random empirical distribution function defined by*

$$G_n(x, y, v, l) = n^{-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{1}\{w_i^-(n) \le x, w_i^+(n) \le y, r_i(n) \le v, c_i(n) \le l\}. \tag{6}$$

1. ***Almost sure convergence in distribution:*** *We assume that there exists some distribution function $G : \mathbb{R}_+^3 \times \mathbb{N}_0^\infty \to [0, 1]$ such that*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} G_n(x, y, v, l) = G(x, y, v, l) \tag{7}$$

   almost surely for all points $(x, y, v, l) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3 \times \mathbb{N}_0^\infty$ for which $G_l(x, y, v) := G(x, y, v, l)$ is continuous in (x, y, v).

2. ***Convergence of average relevance:*** *Let R_n be a random variable distributed according to the empirical distribution of $\mathbf{r}(n)$ and (W^-, W^+, R, C) a random vector distributed according to G. Then R is integrable and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[R_n] = \mathbb{E}[R]$.*

We are then interested in the asymptotic fraction of absolute relevance lost due to the cascade process,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_n} r_i}{\sum_{i \in [n]} r_i},$$

which is closely related to the quantity

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\mathcal{R}_n}{n} := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_n} r_i,$$

by

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_n} r_i}{\sum_{i \in [n]} r_i} = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[R]} \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\mathcal{R}_n}{n}.$$

In Theorem 2.5 below, we will therefore derive an expression for $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{R}_n/n$.

To ensure that Assumption 2.2 holds, a twofold regularity is needed. Firstly, for a vertex with given in- and out-weight, the distribution of the threshold value must stabilize, even though the number of exposures appearing in the sum in (5) increases. Secondly, a law of large numbers for the empirical distribution of the threshold values has to hold.

Example 2.3. *Let $(\mathbf{w}^-, \mathbf{w}^+, \mathbf{r})$ be a triple consisting of in-weight, out-weight and relevance sequences such that the empirical distribution*

$$\tilde{F}_n(x, y, v) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{1}\left\{w_i^-(n) \le x, w_i^+(n) \le y, r_i \le v\right\}, \quad (x, y, v) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3,$$

converges to some distribution function $\tilde{F}(x,y,v)$. To be consistent with Assumption 2.1, we further require that $\tilde{F}(x,y,v) = 0$ for all $x,y \leq x_0$ and some $x_0 > 0$. Further, assume that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[(W_n^-, W_n^+, R_n)] = \mathbb{E}[(W^-, W^+, R)]$, where (W_n^-, W_n^+, R_n) shall be distributed according to $\tilde{F}_n$ and (W^-, W^+, R) according to $\tilde{F}$. Choose some partition of $[0,\infty) \times [0,\infty) \times [0,\infty)$ into countably many half open cubes $D_{j,k,m} := [p_j^-, p_{j+1}^-) \times [p_k^+, p_{k+1}^+) \times [q_m, q_{m+1})$, defined by sequences $p_1^-, p_2^-, \ldots, p_1^+, p_2^+, \ldots$ and $q_1, q_2, \ldots$ determining the endpoints. Further, denote $\mathcal{W}_{j,k,m} := \{i \in [n] \mid (w_i^-, w_i^+, r_i) \in D_{j,k,m}\}$. Let the distributions of E_i and ν_i equal across vertices $i \in \mathcal{W}_{j,k,m}$ and assume them all to be independent, also across different vertices.

We show that Assumption 2.2 is satisfied. For this let $(x,y,v) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3$ and define the deterministic set

$$\mathcal{W}^{(x,y,v)} := \{i \in [n] \mid w_i^- \leq x, w_i^+ \leq y, r_i \leq v\}. \tag{8}$$

For each $i \in \mathcal{W}^{(x,y,v)}$ define the random variables $Y_i^l := \mathbf{1}_{c_i \leq l}$. The set of random variables $\{Y_i^l\}_{i\in\mathcal{W}^{(x,y,v)}}$ is then mutually independent. Further note that for $i_1, i_2 \in \mathcal{W}^{(x,y,v)} \cap \mathcal{W}_{j,k,m}$ the distributions of $Y_{i_1}^l$ and $Y_{i_2}^l$ equal. Furthermore, the distribution is stable for $n \geq l$, meaning it does not change as n increases. Altogether, this implies that the set of random variables $\{Y_i^l\}_{i\in\mathcal{W}^{(x,y,v)}}$ originates from a finite set of different distributions with the number of each category stabilizing as a fraction of n by the regularity of the weight sequence. Since Y_i^l clearly is in $\mathcal{L}^1$, this yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}^{(x,y,v)}} \mathbb{E}[Y_i^l] &= \lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}^{(x,y,v)}} \mathbb{P}(Y_i = 1) \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \sum_{\substack{j,k,m\in\mathbb{N}_0^3: \\ p_j^- < x, p_k^+ < y, q_m < v}} \left|\mathcal{W}^{(x,y,v)} \cap \mathcal{W}_{j,k,m}\right| \mathbb{P}(Y_{i_{j,k,m}} = 1) \\
&=: \lambda(x,y,v,l)
\end{aligned}$$

converges, where $i_{j,k,m} \in \mathcal{W}^{(x,y,v)} \cap \mathcal{W}_{j,k,m}$ are arbitrarily selected indices. By the strong law of large numbers applied to each category, it follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} G_n(x,y,v,l) = \lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}^{(x,y,v)}} Y_i^l = \lambda(x,y,v,l) \tag{9}$$

almost surely.

Note that in the usual statement of the (strong) law of large numbers a single sequence $(X_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is given and convergence of $\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, is then ensured. Here we have a slightly different situation since, although dropped from the notation, the random variables $\{Y_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{W}^{(x,y)}}$ depend on n and in contrast to the standard situation where the $n-1$ values $X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}$ involved in $(n-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} X_i$ are the same as the first $n-1$ values in the sum of of $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. However, since the Y_i are in $\mathcal{L}^4$, the standard proofs using the generalized Chebyshev's inequality and the Borel-Cantelli Lemma can be adjusted to show that the same result holds for this slightly modified situation.

It remains to show that the convergence holds almost surely for all choices of (x,y,v,l). In fact one can show by partitioning the set $\mathbb{R}_+^3 \times \mathbb{N}$ into pieces of small probability under the measure implied by G that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{(x,y,v,l)\in\mathbb{R}_+^3\times\mathbb{N}} |G_n(x,y,v,l) - G(x,y,v,l)| = 0$$

almost surely, which proves the claim.

It should be noted that the partitioning of the vertices into sets with equal exposure and capital distribution does not need to have the particular interval form as above.

As already observed in a similar setting in [2], both, the independence of the random variables $\{E_i(j)\}_{j\in[n-1]} \cup \{\nu_i\}$ for a fixed $i \in [n]$ and the mutual independence of $\{E_i(j)\}_{j\in[n-1]} \cup \nu_i$ and $\{E_j(j)\}_{j\in[n-1]} \cup \nu_j$ for $i \neq j$ can be weakened.

Example 2.4. *Similar as above, we assume that vertices are partitioned into the K classes $\mathcal{W}_1, \dots, \mathcal{W}_K$ with vertices with the same marginal distributions of the capitals and exposures. The sets may depend on n but we shall assume that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} |\mathcal{W}_i| =: \lambda(i), \tag{10}$$

i.e. the fraction of vertices of a given class stabilizes. For each class $i \in [K]$ we are given a generating sequence

$$\{\nu_l^i, E_l^i\}_{l\in\mathbb{N}} \tag{11}$$

with ν_l^i and E_l^i random variables in $\mathbb{R}_+$ respectively $\mathbb{R}_+\backslash\{0\}$. Further, we assume that the sequence $\{\nu_l^i, E_l^i\}_{l\in\mathbb{N}}$ is an infinite exchangeable system for each $i \in [K]$ (see for example [1] for the definition of exchangeability and infinite exchangeable systems). It will serve as the generating sequence for the capitals and exposures for vertices in $\mathcal{W}_i$. To allocate them let $j \in \mathcal{W}_i$ be a vertex. We assign to it the capital $\nu^i_{k_n+(j-1)(n-1)+1}$, where $k_n = \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} m(m-1) = n(n-1)(n-2)/3$, and the exposures $E^i_{k_n+(j-1)(n-1)+1}, \dots, E^i_{k_n+(j-1)(n-1)+j-1}, 0, E^i_{k_n+(j-1)(n-1)+j}, \dots, E^i_{k_n+j(n-1)}$. Observe that by this allocation many entries in the sequence are actually not being used but notation stays bearable. Define now the threshold value as in (5) and for a fixed m and vertex j in class $i \in [K]$ indicator random variables $Y^m_{i,j} := \mathbf{1}_{\{c_j=m\}}$, that determine whether vertex j has threshold value m. Observe that for $n \geq m+1$ every vertex $j \in [n]$ has more than m exposures and the distribution of $Y^m_{i,j}$ is thus independent of n. Let $\beta_i(1), \dots, \beta_i(|\mathcal{W}_i|)$ the indices of the vertices in $\mathcal{W}_i$. By construction then

$$\mathcal{L}(Y^m_{i,\beta_i(1)}, \dots, Y^m_{i,\beta_i(|\mathcal{W}_i|)}) = \mathcal{L}(Y^m_{i,\sigma_i(\beta_i(1))}, \dots, Y^m_{i,\sigma_i(\beta_i(|\mathcal{W}_i|)}) \tag{12}$$

for all $\sigma_i \in \Sigma(\mathcal{W}_i)$, that is, for each $i \in [K]$, the random variables $\{Y^m_{i,j}\}$ build an exchangeable system. Since for fixed n the sequence $\{Y^m_{i,j}\}_{j\in\mathcal{W}_i}$ is just the restriction to a finite subset of variables of an infinite exchangeable system for $|\mathcal{W}_i| \to \infty$ it converges in law to an infinite exchangeable system. Let Δ_i be its directing measure. This implies that the system of random variables

$$(Y^m_{i,j})_{i\in[K], j\in\mathcal{W}_i} \tag{13}$$

forms a multi-exchangeable system (see [19] for definition). Define the empirical measure by

$$\Lambda^m_i := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}_i|} \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{W}_i|} \delta_{Y^m_{i,\beta_i(j)}} \tag{14}$$

for each $i \in [K]$. By [19, Thm.2] convergence in distribution of $\{Y^m_{i,j}\}_{j\in\mathcal{W}_i}$ implies convergence in distribution of the empirical measure sequence $(\Lambda_i)_{i\in[K]}$, without any assumptions on the dependency structure across classes. Since the above considerations apply for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, convergence in distribution of the empirical measure sequence

$$\Lambda_i := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j\in[n]} \delta_{c_j} \tag{15}$$

follows for all $i \in [K]$. By the Skorohod Coupling Theorem [22, Thm. 4.30], there exists a probability space with random elements $\{\tilde{\Lambda}_i\}_{i\in[K]}$ distributed as $\{\Lambda_i\}_{i\in[K]}$ such that $\{\tilde{\Lambda}_i\}_{i\in[K]}$ converges almost surely as required.

We assume in the following that we are given a financial system $(\mathbf{w}^-, \mathbf{w}^+, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{E}, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ satisfying Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 and let (W^-, W^+, R, C) a random vector distributed according to the limiting distribution G. We know by the dominated convergence theorem that the expression $\mathbb{E}\left[W^+\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z) \geq C)\right] - z$ is continuous in z and hence by the intermediate value theorem it must have a root in $(0, \mathbb{E}[W^+])$. We derive a result about the lost relevance $\mathcal{R}_n$ in the system.

Theorem 2.5. *Let (W^-, W^+, R, C) a random vector distributed according to the limiting distribution of $(\mathbf{w}^-, \mathbf{w}^+, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c})$ and assume that $\mathbb{P}(C = 0) > 0$. Let further $\hat{z}$ be the smallest positive solution of*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[W^+\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z) \geq C)\right] \stackrel{!}{=} z.$$

Let $\mathcal{R}_n = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{D}_n} r_i$ be the total loss in relevance of the system at the end of the cascade process in the financial network $(\mathbf{w}^-, \mathbf{w}^+, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{E}, \boldsymbol{\nu})$. Then the following holds:

1. *For all $\epsilon > 0$ with high probability:*

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}_n}{n} \geq \mathbb{E}[R\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Poi}(W^-\hat{z}) \geq C)] - \epsilon. \tag{16}$$

2. *If there exist $\delta > 0$ and $\kappa < 1$ such that $\mathbb{E}\left[W^-W^+\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z) = C - 1)\mathbf{1}_{\{C\geq 1\}}\right] < \kappa$ for all $z \in (\hat{z} - \delta, \hat{z} + \delta)$, then*

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}_n}{n} \xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E}[R\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Poi}(W^-\hat{z}) \geq C)], \text{ as } n \to \infty. \tag{17}$$

When introducing the threshold values, we remarked that they would depend on the particular choice of the procedure we apply in the cascade process. In the following, we will define a certain procedure for which, instead of exposing banks as described by (4), one exposes them sequentially, at each time step considering the contagion of one vertex only:

At the beginning we declare all initially defaulted vertices to be *defaulted* but yet *unexposed*. At each step, a single defaulted, unexposed vertex $i \in [n]$ is picked and exposed to its neighbors. That is, weighted edges to all of its neighbors are drawn. If a neighbor j of i goes bankrupt due to the new edge that is sent from i, it is added to the set of defaulted, unexposed vertices. Otherwise, the capital of j is reduced by the amount $e_{i,j}$. Afterwards, vertex i is removed from the set of unexposed vertices.

We keep track of the following sets and quantities at different steps $0 \leq t \leq n - 1$:

a. Set $U(t)$ which denotes the unexposed vertices at step t. We set $U(0) := \{i \in [n] \mid \nu_i = 0\}$.

b. Set $\overline{U}(t)$ to collect newly defaulted vertices at step t in order to update $U(t)$. We set $\overline{U}(0) := \emptyset$.

c. Set $S(t)$ of solvent vertices at step t.

d. The updated capitals $\{\tilde{\nu}_i(t)\}_{i\in[n]}$ with $\tilde{\nu}_i(0) = \nu_i$ for all $i \in [n]$.

At step $t \in [n - 1]$ the sets and quantities are updated according to the following scheme:

1. Set $\overline{U}(t) := \emptyset$.

2. Choose a vertex $v \in U(t-1)$ according to any rule.

3. Expose v to all of its neighbors in $S(t-1)$. That is, for all vertices $w \in S(t-1)$ set $\tilde{\nu}_w(t) := \max\{0, \tilde{\nu}_w(t-1) - e_{v,w}\}$. Note that $\tilde{\nu}_w(t) := \tilde{\nu}_w(t-1)$ if $e_{v,w} = 0$.

4. Set $S(t) := \{i \in S(t-1) \mid \tilde{\nu}_w(t) > 0\}$ and $\overline{U}(t) := \{i \in S(t-1) \mid \tilde{\nu}_w(t) = 0\}$.

5. Set $U(t) := (U(t-1) \setminus \{v\}) \cup \overline{U}(t)$.

Edges that are sent to already insolvent vertices are not exposed (but they could). Above steps are repeated until step $\hat{t}$, the first time set $U(t)$ becomes empty. Note that $\hat{t}$ is the final number of infected vertices independent of the rule chosen in Step 2. Further, we can complete the exposition of the entire graph by exposing also links to defaulted vertices and links sent from vertices in $S(\hat{t})$, the vertices that remain solvent until the end.

Now, observe that the rule chosen in 2. defines a permutation of the $\hat{t}$ elements of $[n]$ that go bankrupt. Further, for each $j \in [n]$ it defines an ordering of the set of insolvent vertices that send an edge to j, describing the order in which the edges are exposed. This ordering can be completed to a bijective map $\pi_j : [n-1] \to [n] \setminus \{j\}$ by adding vertices that either send no edge to j or are still solvent in the end. To be precise, let π_j denote the ordering for vertex j and let this vertex (after the exposition) have l links sent from insolvent vertices. Then the entries $\pi_j(1), \dots, \pi_j(l)$ list defaulted neighbors in $[n]\setminus\{j\}$ in the order their edges are sent to vertex j. The entries $\pi_j(l+1), \dots, \pi_j(n-1)$ are, in their natural order, the remaining vertices in $[n]\setminus\{j\}$.

Using this sequential procedure for the contagion process, we can then state the proof of Theorem 2.5.

Proof. Since the exact rule chosen in Step 2. does not affect the final set $\mathcal{D}_n$, we assume that always the vertex with smallest global label is chosen. Further, the permutations $\{\pi_j\}_{j\in[n]}$ are completed as outlined above. We describe a sequential construction of a random graph that has the same distribution as the graph constructed in Section 2.1. We work on the same probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}})$ as constructed above but instead of assigning weight $E_{i,j}$ to a potential edge sent from $i \in [n]\setminus\{j\}$ to j, now the $i-$th ($i \in [n-1]$) edge that is sent to vertex j during the sequential exposition shall receive weight $E_{\rho_j(i),j}$, where as before ρ_j is the natural enumeration of $[n]\setminus\{j\}$. That is, edge-weights are not linked to the natural indices of their knots anymore, but instead to the order of the exposition of the edges. One notes, however, that the random graph constructed that way has the same distribution as the random graph constructed before. To see this, observe that by the sequential procedure described by the orderings $\{\pi_j\}_{j\in[n]}$ and the assignment of exposures as described above, a potential edge sent from vertex i to vertex j is now assigned the edge-weight $E_{\rho_j(\pi_j^{-1}(i)),j}$. By exchangeability of the lists $\{E_{i,j}\}_{i\in[n]\setminus\{j\}}$ for $j \in [n]$, the new random variables $\{E_{\rho_j(\pi_j^{-1}(i)),j}\}_{j\in[n],i\in[n]\setminus\{j\}}$ have the same multivariate distribution as $\{E_{i,j}\}_{j\in[n],i\in[n]\setminus\{j\}}$. Obviously, also the new exposures are independent of the edge-indicator functions $\{X_{i,j}\}_{i,j\in[n]}$.

Hence, both constructions result in the same distribution for the random graph. Further, note that the assignment of edge-weights has been conducted in such a way that the threshold values in both versions of the network coincide. As before, they are given as

$$c_i(n) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \nu_i(n) \le 0, \\ \inf\{s \in [n-1] \mid \sum_{l=1}^{s} E_{\rho_i(l),i} \ge \nu_i\}, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

The sequential description of the cascade process now has the advantage that we can reduce it to the threshold model as described in [13]. We can replace the capitals $\tilde{\nu}_i(t)$, which represent monetary thresholds, by integer values $c_i(t)$, which count numbers of neighbors, and update

Steps 3. and 4. in the description of the sequential cascade process according to the rule that if there is an edge sent from v to w ($e_{v,w} > 0$), then set $c_w(t) := c_w(t-1) - 1$. If there is not ($e_{v,w} = 0$), set $c_w(t) := c_w(t-1)$. Then the sets $S(t)$ and $\overline{U}(t)$ are defined by $S(t) := \{i \in S(t-1) \mid c_w(t) > 0\}$ and $\overline{U}(t) := \{i \in S(t-1) \mid c_w(t) = 0\}$. Everything else stays unchanged. Note that the resulting threshold values $c_i(t)$ are only valid for an exposition in the order as specified above. In the threshold model from [13], however, we are free to choose exactly the same rule as we chose in Step 2. of our model since this does not affect the final set of defaulted vertices. Hence, we can replace our exposure model by the threshold model from [13], resulting in the same final set of defaulted vertices. In [13, Thm. 7.2.], a regularity condition on the threshold distribution C is demanded. This is ensured after conditioning on the values of $\{c_i\}_{i\in[n]}$ by Assumption 2.2 that $G_n(x,y,v,l)$ converges to $G(x,y,v,l)$ almost surely for all (x,y,v,l). Applying [13, Thm. 7.2.] hence yields the desired statement. □

In [13], also results about resilience of different networks depending on their limiting distribution (W^-, W^+, C) were stated. They directly translate into the analogue results for our exposure based model simply by using Theorem 2.5.

As in [13], we introduce a sequence $\mathbf{m}(n) = (m_1(n), \dots, m_n(n))$ of binary marks $m_i \in \{0,1\}$ to the system $(\mathbf{w}^-, \mathbf{w}^+, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{E}, \boldsymbol{\nu})$, where $m_i = 0$ means that bank i is infected ex post and hence loses all its capital to start the cascade process. Otherwise, the capital stays the same. We extend Assumption 2.2 such that the new empirical distribution function

$$\overline{G}_n(x,y,v,l,k) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in[n]} \mathbf{1}\{w_i^-(n) \le x, w_i^+(n) \le y, r_i \le v, c_i(n) \le l, m_i(n) \le k\}$$

converges almost surely at all continuity points (x,y,v) of $G_{l,k}(x,y,v) := G(x,y,v,l,k)$ and denote by (W^-, W^+, R, C, M) a random vector distributed according to the limiting distribution $\overline{G}$. We assume that $\mathbb{P}(C = 0) = 0$, but $\mathbb{P}(M = 0) > 0$ such that indeed M causes ex post infection to an uninfected system.

Proposition 2.6. *Assume that the random vector (W^-, W^+, C) is such that $\mathbb{P}(C = 0) = 0$ and there exists $z_0 > 0$ such that for any $0 < z < z_0$,*

$$E\left[W^+ \mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z) \ge C)\right] > z. \tag{18}$$

Then for all M with $\mathbb{P}(M = 0) > 0$, with high probability

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}_n}{n} \ge \mathbb{E}\left[R\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z_0) \ge C)\right] > 0,$$

where $\mathcal{R}_n$ denotes the final loss in relevance in the ex post infected system.

As in [13], we derive the following corollary whose proof again is completely analogue.

Corollary 2.7. *Let $(\mathbf{w}^-, \mathbf{w}^+, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{E}, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ be a system satisfying Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 and (W^-, W^+, R, C) a random vector distributed according to the limiting distribution G. Assume that (W^-, W^+, C) satisfies (18) for $0 < z < z_0$. Then there exists a sequence $\epsilon(n)$ with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \epsilon(n) = 0$, such that if we infect each vertex $i \in [n]$ independently with probability $\epsilon(n)$, then with high probability*

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}_n}{n} \ge \mathbb{E}\left[R\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z_0) \ge C)\right],$$

where $\mathcal{R}_n$ is the final loss in relevance at the end of the infection process.

Hence, a system satisfying (18) can be understood as being non-resilient. On the other hand, the following proposition, which is concerned with resilience of a system and again is completely analogue to the result from [13], can be derived.

Proposition 2.8. *Assume that (W^-, W^+, C) is such that there exists $z_0 > 0$ such that for any $0 < z < z_0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[W^+ \mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z) \geq C)\right] < z \tag{19}$$

and further

$$\limsup_{z \to 0+} \mathbb{E}\left[W^+ W^- \mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z) = C - 1)\mathbf{1}_{\{C \geq 1\}}\right] < 1. \tag{20}$$

Then for any sequence of ex post infections $\{M_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\lim_{i \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(M_i = 0) = 0$, it follows that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists i_ϵ such that for $i \geq i_\epsilon$ with high probability

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}_n}{n} \leq \epsilon.$$

3 Minimal capital requirements

A natural question that is also of highest interest to the regulator is to find threshold values $(c_i)_{i \in [n]}$ which can be determined from observable quantities of the network and satisfy conditions (19) and (20) in Proposition 2.8 or condition (18) in Proposition 2.6 in order to ensure resilience respectively cause non-resilience of the system. Observable quantities are the in- and out-degrees $(d_i^-)_{i \in [n]}$ respectively $(d_i^+)_{i \in [n]}$ which function as estimators of the in- and out-weights $(w_i^-)_{i \in [n]}$ respectively $(w_i^+)_{i \in [n]}$. Hence a functional form $c_i = f(w_i^-, w_i^+)$ seems to be a reasonable choice for the threshold function that could be imposed on bank i by the regulator. In the following, we discuss how this functional form has to look like in the special case when c_i only depends on w_i^-. Such a form of the functional has the interpretation that when bank i calculates its required reserves, given as the sum over the c_i largest of its exposures, this is done to reduce the risk of defaulting itself, whereas a dependence on its out-weight w_i^+ would also take possible defaults caused by bank i into account and is hence harder to communicate to the banks.

A first proposition illustrates the behavior of the functional $\mathbb{E}\left[W^+ \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z) \geq C\right)\right]$ which determines resilience by Propositions 2.6 and 2.8. We keep the assumption that $C > 0$ here.

Proposition 3.1. *Assume that for the limiting distribution (W^-, W^+, C) we can find some $Z \in (0, \infty]$ such that for each $\tilde{z} < Z$ there exist $\tilde{w} = \tilde{w}(\tilde{z})$, $\epsilon = \epsilon(\tilde{z})$ and $\delta = \delta(\tilde{z})$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{C-1}{W^- z} - 1\right| > \epsilon, W^- > \tilde{w}\right) = 0, \quad \forall z \in (\tilde{z} - \delta, \tilde{z} + \delta).$$

That is, C shall be bounded away from some linear dependence on W^- almost surely. Then the functional $\mathbb{E}\left[W^+ \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z) \geq C\right)\right]$ is continuously differentiable at all points $0 < z < Z$. In particular, it holds

$$\mathbb{E}\left[W^+ \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z) \geq C\right)\right] = \int_0^z \mathbb{E}\left[W^- W^+ \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- \zeta) = C - 1\right)\right] \mathrm{d}\zeta,$$

for all $0 \leq z < Z$.

Proof. We fix some $\tilde{z} < Z$ and aim to show that the family

$$\left\{W^- W^+ \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z) = C - 1\right)\right\}_{z \in [\tilde{z} - \delta, \tilde{z} + \delta]}$$

is bounded by some integrable random variable almost surely. This will show continuous differentiability by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem.

By definition of a Poisson random variable, we derive

$$W^-W^+\mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^-z)=C-1\right)=W^-W^+e^{-W^-z}\frac{(W^-z)^{C-1}}{\Gamma(C)}.$$

Then, by applying Stirling's approximation to the Γ-function,

$$W^-W^+\mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^-z)=C-1\right)\leq W^-W^+\exp\left\{-W^-z\left(1-\frac{C-1}{W^-z}+\frac{C-1}{W^-z}\log\left(\frac{C-1}{W^-z}\right)\right)\right\}.$$

In the exponent, we identify the expression $g\left((C-1)/(W^-z)\right)$, where $g(x):=1-x+x\log(x)$. The continuous function g admits the unique minimum $g(x^*)=0$ at $x^*=1$. Since further $\lim_{x\to 0+}g(x)=1$ and $\lim_{x\to\infty}g(x)=\infty$, it holds that $g(x)\geq G$ for $|x-1|>\epsilon$ and some suitable $G>0$. Therefore,

$$W^-W^+\mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^-z)=C-1\right)\leq W^+\left(W^-\exp\left\{-W^-(\tilde{z}-\delta)G\right\}+\tilde{w}\right)\leq W^+M(\tilde{z})\in L^1,$$

almost surely, where $M(\tilde{z})$ is a positive constant depending on $\tilde{z}$ only.

For the last part of the proposition, note that the expression $\mathbb{E}\left[W^+\mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^-z)\geq C\right)\right]$ must be absolutely continuous in z on $[0,Z)$ since it is continuous at $z=0$ and continuously differentiable on $(0,Z)$. It can hence be expressed as an integral of its weak derivative $\mathbb{E}\left[W^-W^+\mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^-z)=C-1\right)\right]$. □

Remark 3.2. Proposition 3.1 is stated for general threshold distributions C and hence needs a condition of almost sure boundedness. An example we are particularly interested in is the case of $C=f(W^-)$ where f is an integer-valued function and satisfies $f(w)=o(w)$. We can then choose $Z=\infty$, $\epsilon=\frac{1}{2}$, $\delta<\tilde{z}$ arbitrary and $\tilde{w}$ such that $f(w)<(\tilde{z}-\delta)w/2$ for all $w\geq\tilde{w}$. The latter one is possible by $f(w)=o(w)$. It follows that $\mathbb{E}\left[W^+\mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^-z)\geq C\right)\right]$ is continuously differentiable at all $z>0$ and $\mathbb{E}\left[W^+\mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^-z)\geq C\right)\right]=\int_0^z\mathbb{E}\left[W^-W^+\mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^-\zeta)=C-1\right)\right]\mathrm{d}\zeta$. In Theorem 3.3 below, we find ourselves in a situation where $f(w)=\mathcal{O}(w^\gamma)$ for $0\leq\gamma<1$ and hence $f(w)=o(w)$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let W^- and W^+ be comonotone Pareto distributed random variables with densities*

$$f_{W^-}(w)=(\beta^--1)\left(w^-_{min}\right)^{\beta^--1}w^{-\beta^-}\mathbf{1}_{\{w\geq w^-_{min}\}}$$

respectively

$$f_{W^+}(w)=(\beta^+-1)\left(w^+_{min}\right)^{\beta^+-1}w^{-\beta^+}\mathbf{1}_{\{w\geq w^+_{min}\}},$$

where $\beta^->2$, $\beta^+>2$, $w^-_{min}>0$ and $w^+_{min}>0$. Let further the threshold value c_i depend on the in-weight w_i^- by some functional form $c_i=f(w_i^-)$, where $f:\mathbb{R}_+\to\mathbb{N}\backslash\{0,1\}$. For

$$\gamma^{crit}:=2+\frac{\beta^--1}{\beta^+-1}-\beta^-\quad\text{and}\quad\alpha^{crit}:=\frac{\beta^+-1}{\beta^+-2}w^+_{min}\left(w^-_{min}\right)^{\beta^--1-\frac{\beta^--1}{\beta^+-1}},$$

the following holds:

1. *If $\gamma^{crit}<0$, then the system is always resilient.*
2. *If $\gamma^{crit}=0$, then the system is resilient if $\liminf_{w\to\infty}f(w)>\alpha^{crit}+1$. It is non-resilient if $\limsup_{w\to\infty}f(w)<\alpha^{crit}+1$.*

3. *If* $\gamma^{crit} > 0$*, then the system is resilient if* $\liminf_{w\to\infty} f(w)/w^{\gamma^{crit}} > \alpha^{crit}$*. It is non-resilient if* $\limsup_{w\to\infty} f(w)/w^{\gamma^{crit}} < \alpha^{crit}$*.*

Remark 3.4. Theorem 3.3 makes statements about resilience respectively non-resilience that depend on the quantity γ^{crit}. Since $\beta^- > 2$ and $\beta^+ > 2$, we note that always $\gamma^{\text{crit}} < 1$. That is, also in 3. it is possible to choose a sub-linear threshold function f that ensures resilience. On the other hand, even the constant threshold function $f(w) = 2$ for all $w \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ensures resilience by 1. whenever $\gamma^{\text{crit}} < 0$. This is always the case if $\beta^- > 3$ and $\beta^+ > 3$, that is, if W^- and W^+ both admit finite second moments. This is in line with the results from [2]. In addition, the theorem makes statements about cases where $\beta^- < 3$ and $\beta^+ > 3$ or vice versa. Such parameters where observed on real markets for example in [11]. In these cases, all $\gamma^{\text{crit}} < 0$, $\gamma^{\text{crit}} = 0$ or $\gamma^{\text{crit}} > 0$ are possible and only the exact values of β^- and β^+ determine the conditions for resilience respectively non-resilience.

Although making strong statements for comonotone Pareto distributed weights, the theorem seems to be somewhat limited because of these assumptions. In Remark 3.5 below, we will therefore weaken them.

Proof. In order to ease notation, we will assume throughout all the proofs that $w^-_{\min} = w^+_{\min} = 1$. The arguments for general $w^-_{\min}$ and $w^+_{\min}$ are completely analogue.

First note that by comonotonicity we have that

$$W^-W^+\mathbb{P}(\text{Poi}(W^-z) = C-1) \le W^-W^+ = (W^-)^{1+\frac{\beta^- -1}{\beta^+ -1}},$$

and for $\gamma^{\text{crit}} < 0$ it holds $\mathbb{E}\left[(W^-)^{1+\frac{\beta^- -1}{\beta^+ -1}}\right] < \infty$. Hence $\mathbb{E}\left[W^+\mathbb{P}\left(\text{Poi}(W^-z) \ge C\right)\right]$ is continuously differentiable with vanishing derivative at $z = 0$ by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem and thus the system must be resilient by Proposition 2.8. This shows 1.

We can then continue by proving 2. First, assume that $\alpha := \limsup_{w\to\infty} f(w) < \alpha^{\text{crit}} + 1$. Since $f(w) \ge 2$ is integer-valued, also $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}\backslash\{0,1\}$. Further, there is some $\tilde{w} \ge 0$ such that $f(w) \le \alpha$ for all $w \ge \tilde{w}$. Define then $\tilde{f}(w) := f(w)\mathbf{1}_{\{w<\tilde{w}\}} + \alpha\mathbf{1}_{\{w\ge\tilde{w}\}} \ge f(w)$. It is enough to show non-resilience for the threshold function $\tilde{f}$ by the ordering. Since $\tilde{f}(w) = o(w)$, Remark 3.2 applies and it is therefore enough to prove

$$\limsup_{z\to 0+} \mathbb{E}\left[W^-W^+\mathbb{P}\left(\text{Poi}(W^-z) = \tilde{f}(W^-) - 1\right)\right] > 1$$

by Proposition 2.8. This follows from

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[W^-W^+\mathbb{P}\left(\text{Poi}(W^-z) = \alpha - 1\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{W^-\ge\tilde{w}\}}\right] &= (\beta^- - 1)\int_{\tilde{w}}^{\infty} w^{1+\frac{\beta^- -1}{\beta^+ -1}-\beta^-} e^{-wz}\frac{(wz)^{\alpha-1}}{\Gamma(\alpha)}\mathrm{d}w \\
&= (\beta^- - 1)\int_{\tilde{w}z}^{\infty} x^{1+\frac{\beta^- -1}{\beta^+ -1}-\beta^-} e^{-x}\frac{x^{\alpha-1}}{\Gamma(\alpha)}\mathrm{d}x \\
&\to (\beta^- - 1)\frac{\Gamma(1+\frac{\beta^- -1}{\beta^+ -1} - \beta^- + \alpha)}{\Gamma(\alpha)}, \quad \text{as } z \to 0, \\
&= \frac{\alpha^{\text{crit}}}{\alpha - 1} \qquad (21)
\end{aligned}$$

since $\alpha < \alpha^{\text{crit}} + 1$.

Now assume that $\alpha := \liminf_{w\to\infty} f(w) > \alpha^{\text{crit}} + 1$ such that $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}\backslash\{0,1\}$ again and $f(w) \ge \alpha$ for all $w \ge \tilde{w}$ and $\tilde{w}$ large enough. Again define $\tilde{f}(w) := f(w)\mathbf{1}_{\{w<\tilde{w}\}} + \alpha\mathbf{1}_{\{w\ge\tilde{w}\}}$.

This time $\tilde{f}(w) \leq f(w)$ and again it is sufficient to prove resilience for the threshold function $\tilde{f}$ instead of f by the ordering. By (21) together with $\alpha > \alpha^{\mathrm{crit}} + 1$ it follows that

$$\limsup_{z \to 0+} \mathbb{E}\left[W^- W^+ \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z) = \tilde{f}(W^-) - 1\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{W^- \geq \tilde{w}\}}\right] < 1.$$

Now we observe that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z) = f(W^-) - 1) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z) \geq 1) = 1 - e^{-W^- z} \leq W^- z$$

and hence $\limsup_{z \to 0+} \mathbb{E}\left[W^- W^+ \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z) = \tilde{f}(W^-) - 1\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{W^- < \tilde{w}\}}\right] = 0$. By Proposition 2.8 and Remark 3.2 resilience follows.

Now assume that $\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}} > 0$ and $\alpha := \liminf_{w \to \infty} f(w)/w^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} > \alpha^{\mathrm{crit}}$. If we choose some $\epsilon > 0$ small enough such that $\tilde{\alpha} := \alpha^{\mathrm{crit}} + \epsilon < \alpha$ and let $\tilde{f}(w) := \left\lceil \tilde{\alpha} w^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} \right\rceil + 1$, then $f(w) \geq \tilde{f}(w)$ for all $w \geq \tilde{w}$ and $\tilde{w} \geq 0$ large enough. As before, it is then sufficient to show $\limsup_{z \to 0+} \mathbb{E}\left[W^- W^+ \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z) = \tilde{f}(W^-) - 1\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{W^- \geq \tilde{w}\}}\right] < 1$ for proving resilience. In order to do so, let first

$$\delta = \delta(W^-) := \frac{\tilde{f}(W^-) - 1}{\tilde{\alpha}(W^-)^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}} - 1,$$

such that $\tilde{f}(W^-) - 1 = (1+\delta)\tilde{\alpha}(W^-)^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}$ and $0 \leq \delta\tilde{\alpha}(W^-)^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} \leq 1$. Using $\delta - (1+\delta)\log(1+\delta) \leq 0$ for all $\delta > -1$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\tilde{f}(W^-) - 1) \log\left(\frac{eW^- z}{\tilde{f}(W^-) - 1}\right) \\
&\qquad = \tilde{\alpha}(W^-)^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} (1+\delta) \log\left(\frac{e(W^-)^{1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} z}{\tilde{\alpha}(1+\delta)}\right) \\
&\qquad \leq \tilde{\alpha}(W^-)^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} \log\left(\frac{e(W^-)^{1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} z}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right) + \delta\tilde{\alpha}(W^-)^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} \log\left(\frac{(W^-)^{1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} z}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right) \\
&\qquad \leq \tilde{\alpha}(W^-)^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} \log\left(\frac{e(W^-)^{1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} z}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right) + \log\left(\max\left\{1, \frac{(W^-)^{1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} z}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right\}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, it follows by Stirling's approximation that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[W^- W^+ \mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Poi}(W^- z) = \tilde{f}(W^-) - 1) \mathbf{1}_{\{W^- \geq \tilde{w}\}}\right] \\
&\qquad \leq \mathbb{E}\left[(W^-)^{1+\frac{\beta^- - 1}{\beta^+ - 1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\tilde{\alpha}(W^-)^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}}} \exp\left(-zW^- + \tilde{\alpha}(W^-)^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} \log\left(\frac{e(W^-)^{1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} z}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right)\right)\right. \\
&\qquad\qquad \left. \cdot \max\left\{1, \frac{(W^-)^{1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} z}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right\} \mathbf{1}_{\{W^- \geq \tilde{w}\}}\right] \\
&\qquad = \frac{\beta^- - 1}{\sqrt{2\pi\tilde{\alpha}}} \int_{\tilde{w}}^{\infty} w^{1+\frac{\beta^- - 1}{\beta^+ - 1} - \frac{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}{2} - \beta^-} \exp\left(-zw + \tilde{\alpha} w^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} \log\left(\frac{ew^{1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} z}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right)\right) \\
&\qquad\qquad \cdot \max\left\{1, \frac{w^{1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} z}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right\} \mathrm{d}w.
\end{aligned}$$

We can split this integral into a lower part from $\tilde{w}$ to $(2ez/\tilde{\alpha})^{\frac{1}{\gamma^{\text{crit}}-1}}$ and an upper part from $(2ez/\tilde{\alpha})^{\frac{1}{\gamma^{\text{crit}}-1}}$ to ∞. For the lower part the involved maximum function becomes 1 and we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\tilde{w}}^{\left(\frac{2ze}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma^{\text{crit}}-1}}} w^{1+\frac{\beta^--1}{\beta^+-1}-\frac{\gamma^{\text{crit}}}{2}-\beta^-} \exp\left(-zw+\tilde{\alpha}w^{\gamma^{\text{crit}}}\log\left(\frac{ew^{1-\gamma^{\text{crit}}}z}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right)\right)\mathrm{d}w \\
&\qquad \le \left(\frac{ez}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right)^{\lambda}\int_{\tilde{w}}^{\left(\frac{2ze}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma^{\text{crit}}-1}}} w^{1+\frac{\beta^--1}{\beta^+-1}-\frac{\gamma^{\text{crit}}}{2}-\beta^-+\lambda(1-\gamma^{\text{crit}})}\left(\frac{ew^{1-\gamma^{\text{crit}}}z}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right)^{\tilde{\alpha}w^{\gamma^{\text{crit}}}-\lambda}\mathrm{d}w \\
&\qquad \le \left(\frac{ez}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right)^{\lambda}\int_{\tilde{w}}^{\left(\frac{2ze}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma^{\text{crit}}-1}}} w^{1+\frac{\beta^--1}{\beta^+-1}-\frac{\gamma^{\text{crit}}}{2}-\beta^-+\lambda(1-\gamma^{\text{crit}})}2^{-\tilde{\alpha}w^{\gamma^{\text{crit}}}+\lambda}\mathrm{d}w \\
&\qquad \le \left(\frac{ez}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right)^{\lambda}\int_{\tilde{w}}^{\infty} w^{1+\frac{\beta^--1}{\beta^+-1}-\frac{\gamma^{\text{crit}}}{2}-\beta^-+\lambda(1-\gamma^{\text{crit}})}\frac{1}{\tilde{\alpha}w^{\gamma^{\text{crit}}}}\mathrm{d}w,
\end{aligned}$$

for $0<\lambda<\gamma^{\text{crit}}/2<1/2$. By the definition of γ^{crit} the involved integral is finite and because of the factor z^{λ} the whole expression tends to 0 as $z\to 0$.

For the upper part of the integral we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\left(\frac{2ze}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma^{\text{crit}}-1}}}^{\infty} w^{1+\frac{\beta^--1}{\beta^+-1}-\frac{\gamma^{\text{crit}}}{2}-\beta^-}\exp\left(-zw+\tilde{\alpha}w^{\gamma^{\text{crit}}}\log\left(\frac{ew^{1-\gamma^{\text{crit}}}z}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right)\right)\max\left\{1,\frac{w^{1-\gamma^{\text{crit}}}z}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right\}\mathrm{d}w \\
&\qquad = z^{\frac{2+\frac{\beta^--1}{\beta^+-1}-\frac{\gamma^{\text{crit}}}{2}-\beta^-}{\gamma^{\text{crit}}-1}}\int_{\left(\frac{2e}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma^{\text{crit}}-1}}}^{\infty} h(x)\exp\left(-z^{\frac{\gamma^{\text{crit}}}{\gamma^{\text{crit}}-1}}g(x)\right)\mathrm{d}x,
\end{aligned}$$

where we substituted $x:=wz^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma^{\text{crit}}}}$ and set

$$h(x):=x^{1+\frac{\beta^--1}{\beta^+-1}-\beta^--\frac{\gamma^{\text{crit}}}{2}}\max\left\{1,\frac{x^{1-\gamma^{\text{crit}}}}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right\}$$

respectively

$$g(x):=x-\tilde{\alpha}x^{\gamma^{\text{crit}}}\log\left(\frac{ex^{1-\gamma^{\text{crit}}}}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right)$$

for $x\ge(2e/\tilde{\alpha})^{\frac{1}{\gamma^{\text{crit}}-1}}$. Since g is a twice continuously differentiable function and admits the unique minimum $g(x^*)=0$ at $x^*=\tilde{\alpha}^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma^{\text{crit}}}}$ with second derivative

$$g''(x^*)=(1-\gamma^{\text{crit}})^2\alpha^{\frac{1}{\gamma^{\text{crit}}-1}}$$

and further h is a continuous function with

$$h(x^*)=\alpha^{\frac{1+\frac{\beta^--1}{\beta^+-1}-\frac{\gamma^{\text{crit}}}{2}-\beta^-}{1-\gamma^{\text{crit}}}},$$

we may apply Laplace's method of integration as stated in [24] for example. We then obtain

$$\int_{\left(\frac{2e}{\tilde{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}-1}}}^{\infty} h(x)\exp\left(-z^{\frac{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}-1}}g(x)\right)\mathrm{d}x = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}\tilde{\alpha}^{\frac{\frac{3}{2}+\frac{\beta^--1}{\beta^+-1}-\frac{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}{2}-\beta^-}{1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}}}{1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} z^{-\frac{\frac{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}{2}}{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}-1}}\left(1+\mathcal{O}\left(z^{\frac{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}{1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}}\right)\right)$$

and altogether the upper part of the integral equals

$$\frac{(\beta^- -1)\tilde{\alpha}^{\frac{\frac{3}{2}+\frac{\beta^--1}{\beta^+-1}-\frac{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}{2}-\beta^-}{1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}-\frac{1}{2}}}{1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}\left(1+\mathcal{O}\left(z^{\frac{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}{1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}}\right)\right) = \frac{\beta^- -1}{1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}\frac{1}{\tilde{\alpha}}+\mathcal{O}\left(z^{\frac{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}{1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}}\right).$$

Since $(\beta^- -1)/(1-\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}) = \alpha^{\mathrm{crit}} < \tilde{\alpha}$ we conclude that

$$\limsup_{z\to 0+}\mathbb{E}\left[W^-W^+\mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^-z)=\tilde{f}(W^-)-1\right)\right]<1,$$

which shows resilience by the same arguments as above. In particular, note that $\tilde{f}(w)=o(w)$ in order to apply Remark 3.2.

We can now approach the final part of the proof. For this part, assume that $\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}>0$ and $\alpha := \limsup_{w\to\infty} f(w)/w^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}} < \alpha^{\mathrm{crit}}$. Similarly as above, we define a new threshold function $\tilde{f}(w) := \left\lfloor (1-\epsilon_1)\alpha^{\mathrm{crit}}w^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}\right\rfloor$ for $\epsilon_1>0$ small enough such that $\alpha<(1-\epsilon_1)\alpha^{\mathrm{crit}}$. Again, there exists some $\tilde{w}\geq 0$ such that $\tilde{f}(w)\geq f(w)$ for $w\geq\tilde{w}$ and it is sufficient to show that $\mathbb{E}\left[W^+\mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^-z)\geq\tilde{f}(W^-)\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{W^-\geq\tilde{w}\}}\right]>z$ in order to prove non-resilience of the threshold function f by condition (18) in Proposition 2.6. To this end, choose arbitrary $\epsilon_2>0$ and $\epsilon_3>0$ such that $1-\epsilon_1<(1-\epsilon_2)(1-\epsilon_3)$ and let $z>0$ small enough such that

$$\tilde{w}\leq\left(\frac{(1-\epsilon_2)z}{(1-\epsilon_1)\alpha^{\mathrm{crit}}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}-1}}$$

as well as

$$z<\left(\epsilon_2^2\epsilon_3\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}-1}\left(\frac{(1-\epsilon_1)\alpha^{\mathrm{crit}}}{1-\epsilon_2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}}. \tag{22}$$

It will then be sufficient to show that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[W^+\mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^-z)\geq\tilde{f}(W^-)\right)\mathbf{1}\left\{W^-\geq\left(\frac{(1-\epsilon_2)z}{(1-\epsilon_1)\alpha^{\mathrm{crit}}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}-1}}\right\}\right]>z.$$

For this, note that for z as specified above and $w\geq((1-\epsilon_2)z)/((1-\epsilon_1)\alpha^{\mathrm{crit}})^{\frac{1}{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}-1}}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Poi}(wz)\geq\tilde{f}(w)) &\geq \mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Poi}(wz)\geq(1-\epsilon_1)\alpha^{\mathrm{crit}}w^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}})\\
&\geq 1-\mathbb{P}(|\mathrm{Poi}(wz)-\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Poi}(wz)]|\geq\epsilon_2 wz)\\
&\geq 1-\frac{1}{\epsilon_2^2}\frac{1}{wz}\\
&\geq 1-\frac{1-\epsilon_2}{(1-\epsilon_1)\epsilon_2^2\alpha^{\mathrm{crit}}w^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}}\\
&\geq 1-\epsilon_3,
\end{aligned}$$

by Chebyshev's inequality and (22). It then follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[W^+\mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Poi}(W^-z)\geq \tilde{f}(W^-)\right)\mathbf{1}\left\{W^-\geq\left(\frac{(1-\epsilon_2)z}{(1-\epsilon_1)\alpha^{\mathrm{crit}}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}-1}}\right\}\right]&\\
&\geq (1-\epsilon_3)(\beta^- -1)\int_{\left(\frac{(1-\epsilon_2)z}{(1-\epsilon_1)\alpha^{\mathrm{crit}}}\right)^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}-1}} w^{\frac{\beta^- -1}{\beta^+ -1}-\beta^-}\mathrm{d}w\\
&= (1-\epsilon_3)\frac{\beta^+ -1}{\beta^+ -2}\left(\frac{(1-\epsilon_2)z}{(1-\epsilon_1)\alpha^{\mathrm{crit}}}\right)^{\frac{1+\frac{\beta^- -1}{\beta^+ -1}-\beta^-}{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}-1}}\\
&> z,
\end{aligned}$$

by the definitions of γ^{crit} and α^{crit} and the fact that $1-\epsilon_1<(1-\epsilon_2)(1-\epsilon_3)$. □

Remark 3.5. Although power law distributions have been verified for many real world networks, Theorem 3.3 seems to be somewhat limited because of the assumption that both W^- and W^+ have to be Pareto distributed. Going through the proof one notes that it is actually enough to assume that W^- and W^+ admit densities $f_{W^-}\in \mathrm{RV}_\infty(-\beta^-)$ of regular variation with index $-\beta^-$ at ∞ respectively $f_{W^+}\in \mathrm{RV}_\infty(-\beta^+)$ of regular variation with index $-\beta^+$ at ∞ in the case of $\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}<0$, however, since then also $1-F_{W^-}\in \mathrm{RV}_\infty(1-\beta^-)$ respectively $1-F_{W^+}\in \mathrm{RV}_\infty(1-\beta^+)$ and $W^+=F^{-1}_{W^+}\left(F_{W^-}(W^-)\right)\leq c(W^-)^{\frac{\beta^- -1+\delta}{\beta^+ -1+\delta}}$ for arbitrarily small δ, some constant $c>0$ and $W^-\geq\tilde{w}$ large enough. The same holds for $\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}\geq 0$ if we tighten the assumptions on $f(w)$ to $f(w)\in\Omega(w^\gamma)$ for some $\gamma>\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}\geq 0$ respectively $f(w)=\mathcal{O}(w^\gamma)$ for some $\gamma<\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}\geq 0$. We leave the details to the reader. Hence, for a big class of very natural weight densities, our theorem identifies sub-linear threshold requirements in terms of the in-weight sequences. Since real world networks are always finite, in contrast to the conditions $f(w)\in\Omega(w^\gamma)$ for resilience respectively $f(w)=\mathcal{O}(w^\gamma)$ for non-resilience, not only the order of f but also the prefactor in function f will be of importance. In the case of Pareto distributions, however, the theorem yields an exact value α^{crit} for this prefactor in the case where the order is given by the critical exponent γ^{crit}. It can be taken as a reference value for weight laws that are not given by Pareto distributions, as well.

A first generalization for the dependence structure of W^- and W^+ can be obtained in the case of $\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}>0$. If instead of comonotone weights we only assume an upper tail dependence between the two random variables, that is $\lim_{u\to 1}\mathbb{P}\left(W^+\geq F^{-1}_{W^+}(u)\mid W^-\geq F^{-1}_{W^-}(u)\right)=:p>0$, then it is actually enough for non-resilience that $\limsup_{w\to\infty} f(w)/w^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}<p$. In particular, this is the case if $\limsup_{w\to\infty} f(w)/w^{\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}}=0$, for example if $f(w)=\mathcal{O}(w^\gamma)$ for some $\gamma<\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}$.

For a second generalization, observe that in the case of $\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}<0$ we argue that W^-W^+ is an integrable function. This statement always stays true even if we drop the assumption of comonotonicity. This is due to the fact that the comonotone copula maximizes the expression $\mathbb{E}[W^-W^+]$.

A further generalization in the cases of $\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}=0$ and $\gamma^{\mathrm{crit}}>0$ can be made by noting that for $g(w):=\mathbb{E}\left[W^+\mid W^-=w\right]$ we derive that

$$\int_{w^-_{\min}}^{\infty}\left(g(w)\right)^{\beta^+-1-\epsilon_1}w^{-\beta^-+\epsilon_2}\mathrm{d}w<\infty,$$

by integrability of $(W^+)^{\beta^+-1-\epsilon_1}$, where $\epsilon_1>0$ and $\epsilon_2>0$ are chosen appropriately according

to the slowly varying parts of the involved regularly varying functions. Defining

$$h(w) := g(w)w^{-\frac{\beta^- - 1}{\beta^+ - 1}}$$

as the ratio of the conditional expectation with respect to the one in the comonotone Pareto case, we observe that

$$(h(w))^{\beta^+ - 1 - \epsilon_1} \, w^{-1-\epsilon_1 \frac{\beta^- - 1}{\beta^+ - 1} + \epsilon_2}$$

must be an integrable function. By choosing $\epsilon_2 < \epsilon_1(\beta^- - 1)/(\beta^+ - 1)$, this condition is satisfied for $h(w)$ bounded by some constant $C > 0$. For very irregular dependency structures between W^- and W^+ it is possible in general that above integrability condition is satisfied without such a bound C on $h(w)$. For typical and sensible dependencies, however, one can expect the existence of the bound C. Along the lines of the proof of Theorem 3.3 one identifies the new critical value $\left(\alpha^{\text{crit}}\right)' := C\alpha^{\text{crit}}$ for resilience in 2. and 3. In particular, it then holds resilience for $f(w) \in \Omega(w^\gamma)$ for some $\gamma > \gamma^{\text{crit}}$.

Finally, we want to remark on the assumption $f(w) \geq 2$ in Theorem 3.3. In other words, this means that each bank must at least be capable of sustaining the default of its largest debtor. This requirement has already been implemented in an even stricter form in the 'Supervisory framework for measuring and controlling large exposures' by the 'Basel Committee on Banking Supervision' from 2014 which will become applicable as from 2019 [4]. While being economically sensible, the assumption is actually not necessary in order to derive analytical results. For the case of $\gamma^{\text{crit}} < 0$ it is enough to demand $\mathbb{E}\left[W^- W^+ \mathbf{1}_{\{f(W^-)=1\}}\right] < 1$ in order to ensure resilience since then the derivative of $\mathbb{E}\left[W^+ \mathbb{P}\left(\text{Poi}(W^- z) \geq f(W^-)\right)\right]$ is still differentiable with derivative less than 1 at $z = 0$. In the case of $\gamma^{\text{crit}} \geq 0$, we can simply consider the part $\mathbb{E}\left[W^- W^+ \mathbb{P}\left(\text{Poi}(W^- z) = f(W^-) - 1\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{f(W^-)=1\}}\right]$ separately which will lead to a change in α^{crit} but does not further affect the computations. In particular, for $f(w) \in \Omega(w^\gamma)$ for some $\gamma > \gamma^{\text{crit}}$, resilience is preserved as long as $\mathbb{E}\left[W^- W^+ \exp\left(-W^- z\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{f(W^-)=1\}}\right] < 1$.

4 Simulation study

All previous chapters have been formulated in the limit as the number of banks n tends to infinity and the fraction of initially defaulted banks p tends to zero. It is hence reasonable to investigate whether the results are good approximations also for real networks which are finite with only a few thousand institutions and experience a shock of a finite fraction of banks. Since our model is based on the non-observable weight-parameters, one would have to estimate them from the degree-sequences which are observable for real network configurations at least by the regulating institutions. Hence, we will start this section by a short note on weight-estimation. Since specific transactions between banks are not disclosed to the public there is no data basis for us to investigate real networks. Instead, we will discuss our findings by simulating networks.

4.1 Estimation of weights

Since the weight sequences are not directly observable from real networks, we give a few lines here on how to estimate them from data that is observable. First note that for a network G of size n with edge set $E(G)$ the likelihood of weight sequences $\mathbf{w}^- = (w_1^-, \ldots, w_n^-)$ and

$\mathbf{w}^+ = (w_1^+, \dots, w_n^+)$ is given by

$$L(w_1^-, w_1^+, \dots, w_n^-, w_n^+ \mid E(G)) = \prod_{(i,j)\in E(G)} \left(\frac{w_i^+ w_j^-}{n} \wedge 1 \right) \prod_{\substack{(i,j)\notin E(G) \\ i\neq j}} \left(1 - \frac{w_i^+ w_j^-}{n} \vee 0 \right).$$

One can always derive the maximum-likelihood estimators $\hat{w}_1^-, \dots, \hat{w}_n^-, \hat{w}_1^+, \dots, \hat{w}_n^+$ by numerically maximizing L then. In order to obtain some intuition about them, we further want to derive an approximation of the estimators. For this, we assume that $w_i^+ w_j^- \ll n$ for all $i, j \in [n]$ which is a reasonable assumption at least when W^+W^- is integrable. We can hence approximate

$$L(w_1^-, w_1^+, \dots, w_n^-, w_n^+ \mid E(G)) \approx \frac{1}{n^s} \prod_{i\in[n]} \left(w_i^-\right)^{d_i^-} \left(w_i^+\right)^{d_i^+} \exp\left(-w_i^+ \frac{\sum_{j\in[n]} w_j^-}{n} \right),$$

where $s := \sum_{i\in[n]} d_i^- = \sum_{i\in[n]} d_i^+$. By the product form $w_i^+ w_j^-$ in (1), we are free to multiply all out-weights w_i^+ by some constant α if, at the same time, we multiply all in-weights by its inverse α^{-1}. Motivated by the fact that $\sum_{i\in[n]} d_i^- = \sum_{i\in[n]} d_i^+$, we use this degree of freedom to set $\sum_{i\in[n]} w_i^- = \sum_{i\in[n]} w_i^+$ and want to maximize the approximated likelihood function under this constraint. (Other constraints, such as $\sum_{i\in[n]} w_i^- = \lambda = \text{const}$, are also possible and lead to the same result in the end.) By Lagrange's multiplier method this leads to a maximization of

$$\prod_{i\in[n]} \left(w_i^-\right)^{d_i^-} \left(w_i^+\right)^{d_i^+} \exp\left(-w_i^+ \frac{\sum_{j\in[n]} w_j^-}{n} \right) + \lambda \left(\sum_{k\in[n]} w_k^- - w_k^+ \right).$$

Differentiating with respect to w_l^- resp. w_l^+ for all $l \in [n]$ then leads to the equations

$$0 = \prod_{i\in[n]} \left(w_i^-\right)^{d_i^-} \left(w_i^+\right)^{d_i^+} \exp\left(-w_i^+ \frac{\sum_{j\in[n]} w_j^-}{n} \right) \left(\frac{d_l^-}{w_l^-} - \frac{\sum_{k\in[n]} w_k^+}{n} \right) + \lambda$$

respectively

$$0 = \prod_{i\in[n]} \left(w_i^-\right)^{d_i^-} \left(w_i^+\right)^{d_i^+} \exp\left(-w_i^+ \frac{\sum_{j\in[n]} w_j^-}{n} \right) \left(\frac{d_l^+}{w_l^+} - \frac{\sum_{k\in[n]} w_k^-}{n} \right) - \lambda,$$

which can be rewritten as $w_l^- = \lambda^- d_l^-$ and $w_l^+ = \lambda^+ d_l^+$ for some constants λ^- and λ^+ independent of l. Using the constraints $\sum_{i\in[n]} w_i^- = \sum_{i\in[n]} w_i^+$ and $\sum_{i\in[n]} d_i^- = \sum_{i\in[n]} d_i^+$, we obtain that $\lambda = 0$ and $\lambda^- = \lambda^+ = \sqrt{\sum_{i\in[n]} d_i^- / n}$ such that the approximated likelihood function is maximized by

$$w_i^- = d_i^- \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j\in[n]} d_j^-}{n}}, \qquad w_i^+ = d_i^+ \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j\in[n]} d_j^-}{n}}.$$

That is, the approximated weight estimators are proportional to the observed degrees and only normalized in a certain sense. The closer $\max_{i,j\in[n]} d_i^+ d_j^- / n$ is to zero, the better is above approximation of $w_i^+ w_j^- / n = d_i^+ d_j^- \sum_{k\in[n]} d_k^- / n^2 \ll 1$. On networks where $\max_{i,j\in[n]} d_i^+ d_j^- / n$ is large, $\mathbf{w}^-$ and $\mathbf{w}^+$ have to be estimated numerically.

4.2 Simulations

For our simulations, we make use of the findings in [11] that the empirical in- and out-degrees of the Brazilian banking network are power law distributed. For November 2008, the authors of [11] derived the power law exponents $\beta^- = 2.132$ and $\beta^+ = 2.8861$. In our weight-based model, these distributions are obtained by choosing in- and out-weights power law distributed with exponents β^- and β^+ as well. In addition to this, we assume them to be comonotone and Pareto distributed with minimal weights $w^-_{\min} = w^+_{\min} = 1$.

In a first simulation, we assume absence of contagious links but nothing more. That is, we assume that each bank is assigned the constant threshold value 2. In order to start the cascade process, we assume initial default of $p = 1\%$ uniformly chosen banks in the network. We then simulate the default process for $n \in \{100k \mid k \in [100]\}$ and 100 different configurations of the random network for each n. The results for the final fraction of defaulted banks are plotted in Figure 1. As can be seen from Figure 2, the theoretical value of the final default fraction as n tends to infinity can be determined to be approximately 84.54%. This value is drawn as a red line in Figure 1. Already for small n, most of the simulations yield results that are close to this theoretical value. As n grows to 10^4 the final fractions become even more precise. In particular, the network is anything but resilient to the initial shock, as predicted in [2] for networks without contagious links and which satisfy a second moment condition on the degree distributions.



Figure 1: Convergence of the final fraction of defaulted banks for networks of finite size

Instead of the absence of contagious links, Theorem 3.3 predicts certain capital requirements to make networks resilient to small initial shocks in our model. Keeping above network parameters unchanged, we compute $\alpha^{\text{crit}} \approx 2.13$ and $\gamma^{\text{crit}} \approx 0.468$. A natural choice for the threshold of bank $i \in [n]$ is then $c_i = \min\{2, \lfloor \alpha(w_i^-)^\gamma \rfloor\}$, where $\alpha = \alpha^{\text{crit}}(1+\delta)$, $\gamma = \gamma^{\text{crit}}(1+\delta)$ and $\delta \in [-1, \infty)$ denotes a (possibly negative) buffer. By Theorem 3.3, networks are resilient to initial shocks for $\delta > 0$ and non-resilient for $\delta < 0$. The influence of δ on the function $f(z) = \mathbb{E}[W^+\mathbb{P}(\text{Poi}(W^-z) \geq C)] - z$ can be seen in Figure 3. In particular, one notes that resilience for positive δ stems from the negative hump of $f(z)$ subsequent to zero. Further note, however, that resilience is only guaranteed to shocks whose size tends to zero. Even networks, whose size tends to infinity but which are shocked by a strictly positive initial default fraction p, will only be resilient for $\delta > \delta_p$ for a certain $\delta_p > 0$. This is because $f(z)$ depends on p by $f(z) = (1-p)\mathbb{E}[W^+\mathbb{P}(\text{Poi}(W^-z) \geq C)] + p\mathbb{E}[W^+] - z$ if a uniformly chosen fraction p of all banks in the network defaults at the beginning. The influence of p on the function $f(z)$ can be seen in Figure 4. In order for a network to be resilient to an initial shock of p the hump subsequent



Figure 2: Determination of the theoretical final default fraction for networks whose size grows to infinity and with $p = 1\%$ initial defaults and constant threshold 2. In blue: $f(z) = (1-p)\mathbb{E}[W^+\mathbb{P}(\text{Poi}(W^-z) \geq 2)] + p\mathbb{E}[W^+] - z$ with root $\hat{z} \approx 1.94433$. In red: $g(z) = (1-p)\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(\text{Poi}(W^-z) \geq 2)] + p$ with $g(\hat{z}) \approx 0.845434$.

to 0 needs to become negative in Figure 4. By this, it is always possible to determine the least necessary buffer δ to make a system resilient to a shock of initial default fraction p numerically. Whereas one needs a buffer of $\delta = 0.0839$ to stop an initial default fraction of $p = 0.01$ from infecting a large part of the system, it only requires $\delta = 0.0235$ for $p = 0.001$ for example. All corresponding values of δ for $p = 0.001k$, $k \in [10]$, are listed in Table 1. Note that a buffer of $\delta = 0.0839$ yields $\alpha = 2.31$ and $\gamma = 0.507$ and hence the required capital in order to make the system resilient to shocks of 1% is still strongly sublinear.



Figure 3: Influence of δ on the shape of $f(z) = \mathbb{E}[W^+\mathbb{P}(\text{Poi}(W^-z) \geq C)] - z$ with capital requirements $c_i = \min\{2, \lfloor(\alpha^{\text{crit}}(1+\delta)(w_i^-)^{\gamma^{\text{crit}}(1+\delta)}\rfloor\}$

We want to verify above results by simulations. For this, we simulate a very large network consisting of $n = 10^6$ banks and keeping the network topology constant we let δ vary between -1 and 1 in steps of 10^{-3}. For each simulated network, we then find that it becomes resilient for δ large enough. This becomes visible by a jump of the final fraction of defaulted banks at this particular δ as illustrated in Figure 5 for a sample network. The jump shows that in the end it is only one bank whose default lets the whole system crash.



Figure 4: Influence of p on the shape of $f(z) = (1-p)\mathbb{E}[W^+\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Poi}(W^-z) \geq C)] + p\mathbb{E}[W^+] - z$ for the example of $\delta = 0.0839$.

Table 1: List of values for the buffer δ corresponding to initial default fraction p

p	0.001	0.002	0.003	0.004	0.005	0.006	0.007	0.008	0.009	0.010
δ	0.0235	0.0344	0.0430	0.0504	0.0571	0.0636	0.0689	0.0742	0.0791	0.0839

Keeping track of the values of δ at which the final fraction drops to near $p = 1\%$ for 10^4 simulated networks yields the distribution shown in Figure 6. It shows a peak at about $\delta = 0.076$ and hence supports our theoretical findings from above. Deviations from the theoretical value of $\delta_{0.01} \approx 0.0839$ are small and can be explained by the finite (albeit very large) network size.

Having looked at the theoretical capital requirements for very large networks, it is now sensible to turn our attention to networks of a few thousand banks as they exist in the real world. Figure 7 shows the final fraction in networks of size $n \leq 10^4$ with initial default fraction $p = 0.01$ for δ between -0.3 and 0. For each network size n, we have taken the average over 10^5 simulations.

The figure shows that finite networks of size $n \leq 10^4$ are already resilient for $\delta = 0$. Even for $\delta = -0.2$ the network is rather resilient for $n \leq 2,000$ respectively for $n \leq 6,000$ if $\delta = -0.1$. That is, our result is robust in the sense that already lower capital requirements are sufficient to make the systems resilient to small shocks. The deviations stem from the relatively small network sizes of only a few thousand banks. Here, rare extreme values of vertex weights fail to appear despite the missing second moment condition or they are not infected by the uniform initial infection. For managing systemic risk in real networks it might, however, be of interest not only how uniform initial default influences the system but also how the default of the largest banks does. In a further simulation, we hence choose the $\lfloor pn \rfloor$ largest (by weights) banks in the network to default at the beginning. The function $f(z)$ then qualitatively keeps its shape as in Figures 3 and 4 but becomes larger. Again, we can compute corresponding values of δ and p numerically. We list our results in Table 2. As one expects, these values are larger than the ones we obtained for uniform infection in Table 1, but only by a factor of about 2 and as before the resulting capital requirements are strongly sublinear.



Figure 5: A typical result for the final fraction in a network of 10^6 banks with initial default fraction of $p = 1\%$ as δ varies between -1 and 1 in steps of 10^{-3}.



Figure 6: The distribution of jump points for 10^4 networks of size $n = 10^6$ with initial default fraction $p = 1\%$.

References

[1] D. J. Aldous. *École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIII — 1983*, chapter Exchangeability and related topics, pages 1–198. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1985.

[2] H. Amini, R. Cont, and A. Minca. Resilience to contagion in financial networks. *Mathematical Finance*, 26(2):329–365, 2016.

[3] Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. Global systemically important banks: updated assessment methodology and the higher loss absorbency requirement, 2013.

[4] Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. Standards: Supervisory Framework for Measuring and Controlling Large Exposures, 2014.

[5] S. Battiston, M. Puliga, R. Kaushik, P. Tasca, and G. Caldarelli. DebtRank: Too Central to Fail? Financial Networks, the FED and Systemic Risk. *Scientific Reports*, 2:541, 2012.



Figure 7: Average final fraction of defaulted banks in networks of size n

Table 2: List of values for the buffer δ corresponding to initial default fraction p

p	0.001	0.002	0.003	0.004	0.005	0.006	0.007	0.008	0.009	0.010
δ	0.0409	0.0605	0.0761	0.0890	0.1003	0.1102	0.1190	0.1271	0.1346	0.1413

[6] Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Calibrating the GSIB Surcharge, 2015.

[7] M. Boss, H. Elsinger, M. Summer, and S. Thurner. Network topology of the interbank market. *Quantitative Finance*, 4(6):677–684, 2004.

[8] A. Capponi, P.-C. Chen, and D. D. Yao. Liability Concentration and Systemic Losses in Financial Networks. *Operations research*, forthcoming, 2016.

[9] R. Carmona, J.-P. Fouque, and L.-H. Sun. Mean filed games and systemic risk. *Communications in Mathematical Sciences*, 2014.

[10] C. Chong and C. Klüppelberg. Contagion in financial systems: A Bayesian network approach. *Preprint*, 2016.

[11] R. Cont, A. Moussa, and E. Santos. Network structure and systemic risk in banking systems. In J.-P. Fouque and J. Langsam, editors, *Handbook on Systemic Risk*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013.

[12] B. Craig and G. von Peter. Interbank tiering and money center banks. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 23(3):322–347, 2014.

[13] N. Detering, T. Meyer-Brandis, and K. Panagiotou. Bootstrap percolation in directed and inhomogeneous random graphs. *preprint*, 2015.

[14] D. Duffie and K. J. Singleton. *Credit Risk: Pricing, Measurement, and Management*. Princeton University Press, 2003.

[15] L. Eisenberg and T. H. Noe. Systemic Risk in Financial Systems. *Management Science*, 47(2):236–249, 2001.

[16] J. Fouque and T. Ichiba. Stability in a Model of Interbank Lending. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 4(1):784–803, 2013.

[17] J.-P. Fouque and J. A. Langsam, editors. *Handbook on systemic risk*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013.

[18] P. Gai and S. Kapadia. Contagion in Financial Networks. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*, 466:2401–2423, 2010.

[19] C. Graham. Chaoticity for Multiclass Systems and Exchangeability within Classes. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 45(4):1196–1203, 2008.

[20] T. R. Hurd. *Contagion! Systemic Risk in Financial Networks*. Springer, 2016.

[21] S. Janson. The Probability That a Random Multigraph Is Simple. *Comb. Prob. Comput.*, 18(1-2):205–225, 2009.

[22] O. Kallenberg. *Foundations of Modern Probability*. Springer, New York, 2nd edition, 2001.

[23] O. Kley, C. Klüppelberg, and L. Reichel. Systemic risk through contagion in a core-periphery structured banking network. 2014.

[24] D. A. Korshunov, V. I. Piterbarg, and E. Hashorva. On the asymptotic Laplace method and its application to random chaos. *Mathematical Notes*, 97(5):878–891, 2015.

[25] S. C. Olhede and P. J. Wolfe. Degree-Based Network Models. 2013.

[26] S. Poledna, J. L. Molina-Borboa, S. Martínez-Jaramillo, M. van der Leij, and S. Thurner. The multi-layer network nature of systemic risk and its implications for the costs of financial crises. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 20:70–81, 2015.

[27] S. Poledna and S. Thurner. Elimination of systemic risk in financial networks by means of a systemic risk transaction tax. *Quantitative Finance*, 2016.

[28] L. C. G. Rogers and L. A. M. Veraart. Failure and Rescue in an Interbank Network. *Management Science*, 59(4):882–898, 2013.

[29] S. Weber and K. Awiszus. The Joint Impact of Bankruptcy Costs, Fire Sales and Cross-Holdings on Systemic Risk in Financial Networks. *Working Paper, Leibniz Universität Hannover and Center for Risk and Insurance*, 2016.